

3. METHODOLOGY

A long chain of operations is needed to obtain the size and the strain contributions; there is thus a risk that the final result will no longer be compatible with the experimental data. Only a few years after the introduction of this method, Garrod *et al.* (1954) wrote

Hence, in any attempt to distinguish between particle size or strain broadening from a particular material, the use of the one or the other of these functions [Gaussian and Lorentzian] (together with the appropriate relationship between B , b , and β) involves an intrinsic initial assumption about the cause of the broadening, when the object of the investigation is to discover the cause. Such an assumption must inevitably weight the experimental results, partially at least, in favour of one or the other of the two effects. In this connexion it is therefore perhaps significant that in most previous work on the cause of line broadening from cold-worked metals, those investigators who have used the Warren relationship between B , b , and β have concluded that lattice distortion was the predominant factor, whilst those who have employed the Scherrer correction found that particle size was the main cause. The best procedure in such work therefore is to make no assumptions at all about the shape of the experimental line profiles . . .

This is owing to the fact that a direct connection between the experimental data and the final microstructural result does not really exist in those methods and that the whole information contained in the pattern is not exploited.

3.6.2.4. Beyond the Warren–Averbach method

The work of Alexander (see, for example, Alexander, 1954; Klug & Alexander, 1974; and references therein) was definitely pioneering here. Alexander proposed a set of formulae for the synthesis of the instrumental profile, with the aim of obtaining a correction curve to subtract the instrumental contribution to the measured breadth of the profiles (thus improving the accuracy of the size determination). The true power of this idea was not fully exploited, as the Scherrer formula was still used for microstructure analysis. A few decades later, Adler, Houska and Smith (Adler & Houska, 1979; Houska & Smith, 1981) proposed the use of simplified analytical functions to describe the instrument, size and strain broadening and to perform the convolution of the equation numerically *via* Gauss–Legendre quadrature. Rao & Houska (1986) improved the procedure by carrying out part of the integration analytically (for monodisperse spheres). The microstructure parameters are directly obtained from a fit of this numerical peak to the experimental data. The fit partly solves the problem of peak overlap: in traditional methods it is in fact impossible to establish the extent of overlap between the peaks and therefore to correctly extract the area or maximum intensity. The method is a major step forward, but is still related to the Warren–Averbach approach, as just two multiple-order peaks are considered.

Cheary & Coelho (1992, 1994, 1998*a,b*) pushed the idea forward with the fundamental parameters approach (FPA). The FPA is based on the intuition of Alexander (1954) and the general idea of the Rietveld (1969) method: the calculation speed is greatly improved to facilitate widespread use. The convolution is performed directly in 2θ space, where instrumental aberrations, which were extensively explored by these researchers, occur. Very simplistic models were employed to describe the broadening due to the specimen; the whole pattern (and therefore all of the measured information) is considered in place of one or more peaks and of the extracted information. For structural analysis and for the Rietveld method, the FPA is a huge step forward, as it allows a more accurate determination of lattice parameters and

integrated intensities. Moreover, it enables some line-profile analysis on low-quality patterns or on data affected by strong peak asymmetry.

3.6.2.5. Whole powder pattern modelling (WPPM)

The techniques briefly illustrated in the previous section, as well as other alternatives appearing in the literature before the beginning of this century, lack full completeness for quantitative microstructure analysis. The whole powder pattern modelling method attempted to fill this gap. Starting with the same ideas as in Section 3.6.2.1 (*i.e.* peaks as convolution), it uses equations (3.6.5) and (3.6.6) to generate the peaks within a fully convolutional approach. The peak profiles are therefore generated from the Fourier transform of each broadening component; the resulting $h(x)$ function accounts just for the shape of the profile, which in turn can be represented as (Scardi & Leoni, 2002)

$$I_{\{hkl\}}(s) = k(d^*)h(s) = k(d^*) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}(L) \exp(2\pi i L s) dL, \quad (3.6.11)$$

where $k(d^*)$ includes all constant or known functions of d^* (*e.g.* structure factor, Lorentz–polarization factor *etc.*), whereas $\mathcal{C}(L)$ is the Fourier transform of the peak profile. The term k is a function of d^* ; it is not necessarily a function of s , as the peak is actually centred in $d_{\{hkl\}}^*$.

Equation (3.6.11) assumes that the broadening sources act on the entire family of symmetry-equivalent reflections $\{hkl\}$ and therefore that a multiplicity term [included in $k(d^*)$] can be used: however, certain types of defects (*e.g.* faults) can act independently on each of the symmetry-equivalent reflections. Equation (3.6.11) then becomes more correctly

$$I_{\{hkl\}}(s) = k(d^*) \sum_{hkl} w_{hkl} I_{hkl}(s_{hkl}) = k(d^*) \sum_{hkl} w_{hkl} I_{hkl}(s - \delta_{hkl}), \quad (3.6.12)$$

where w_{hkl} is a weight function depending on the lattice symmetry and actual broadening source, $s_{hkl} = d^* - (d_{\{hkl\}}^* + \delta_{hkl}) = s - \delta_{hkl}$ is the distance, in reciprocal space, from the centroid of the peak hkl , and δ_{hkl} is the shift from $d_{\{hkl\}}^*$, the Bragg position in the absence of defects. The sum is over independent profile subcomponents selected on the basis of the specific defects (*e.g.* two for the $\{111\}$ family in f.c.c. when faults are present; selection is based on the value of $|L_0| = |h + k + l|$, *i.e.* 3 or 1).

According to equation (3.6.5), the function $\mathcal{C}(L)$ is the product of the Fourier transforms of the broadening contributions. In a real material, broadening is mostly due to the specific nature of the instrument, to the finite size of the coherently diffracting domain (size effect) and to the presence of defects such as, for example, dislocations and faults (Cheary & Coelho, 1992; van Berkum, 1994; Scardi & Leoni, 2002). Taking these into account,

$$\mathcal{C}(L) = T^{\text{IP}}(L) A_{hkl}^S(L) \langle \exp[2\pi i \psi_{hkl}(L)] \rangle \langle \exp[2\pi i \varphi_{hkl}(L)] \rangle \dots, \quad (3.6.13)$$

where $T^{\text{IP}}(L)$ and $A_{hkl}^S(L)$ are the FTs of the instrumental and domain-size components, respectively, whereas the terms in angle brackets $\langle \rangle$ are average phase factors related to lattice distortions (ψ_{hkl}) and faulting (φ_{hkl}).

Equation (3.6.13) is the core of the WPPM method: as indicated by the ellipsis, any other broadening source can easily be considered by including the corresponding (complex) Fourier transform (*i.e.* the corresponding average phase factor) in equation (3.6.13). Expressions are known for several cases of practical interest (see, for example, Scardi & Leoni, 2002, 2004,